

7

Nigaṇṭha Nāta,putta Sutta

The Discourse on Nirgrantha Nāta,putta | S 41.8/4:298-300

Theme: Citta Gaha,pati does not go by faith and confounds Nāta,putta

Translated by Piya Tan ©2007

1 Citta the houselord's accomplishments

1.1 CITTA AS DHARMA TEACHER. Citta is declared by the Buddha to be the foremost of Dharma-speakers amongst the laymen disciples (A 1:26).¹ The native commentary on the Nigaṇṭha Nāta,putta Sutta (S 41.8) says that Citta the houselord approaches Nirgrantha Nāta,putta, firstly to vindicate the Buddhists from being blamed that they do not show hospitality to anyone else. Citta shows every courtesy when he visits Nāta,putta, and warmly converses with him. Secondly, he approaches the Jains to refute their false views, at which time, says the Commentary, he is already a non-returner (SA 3:100).

Several times we see him teaching the Dhamma to bhikkhus, and the bhikkhus applaud him as one who has “the eye of wisdom that ranges over the deep Word of the Buddha.” **The Citta Saṃyutta** preserves three discourses of such instructions, that is, as follows:

Saññojana Sutta	the senses as fetters	S 41.1/4:281-283	SD 32.11
Kāma,bhū Sutta 1	the 3 roots as bondages	S 41.5/4:291 f	SD 71.9
Go,datta Sutta	the liberations of mind	S 41.7/4:295-297	SD 60.4

Even on his deathbed, Citta remains clearly mindful and instructing the Dharma to the devas, who are pleading with him to choose a rebirth that would conduce to their glory. **The Gilāna Dassana Sutta** (S 41.10) records these remarkable final moments of Citta's life, especially how he admonishes the devas on the nature of impermanence.² All these positive accounts of Citta points to one clear fact—that he is the wisest of the Buddhist laymen.

1.2 CITTA AS MEDITATOR. The Nigaṇṭha Nāta,putta Sutta depicts Nāta,putta as rejecting the idea of *thought-free* dhyanic experience [§§5-6]. Citta is clearly aware of this, and tries to point this out to the Jains. In answer to Nāta,putta's question on the possibility of thought-free dhyana [2.2], Citta answers: “Here, bhante, I do not go by faith in the Blessed One” [§§6.1-2].

Before he can say anything further, Nāta,putta triumphantly declares that Citta “has *no* faith” in the Buddha! [§6.4]. Nāta,putta reads too much into Citta's reply, by going on to declare, using two similes that thought-free dhyanic meditation is impossible [§6.5-6]. This, in fact, puts Citta in a fix: he has been misquoted! If he were to remain silent, he would be acquiescing to Nāta,putta's false statement (which Nāta,putta is unaware of, too).³

The best way to deal with falsehood, especially concerning meditation, is the truth. However, before that Citta has to ensure that Nāta,putta is ready for the truth, even if he is unwilling or unable to accept it just yet. So Citta asks him which is “more sublime” (*pañīta,tara*), faith or knowledge, and Nāta,putta answers that it is knowledge (*ñāna*) [§7]. Once this is established, Citta makes his lion-roar and defines his experience of the four dhyanas [§8].

Nāta,putta is unimpressed; in fact, he is terribly confounded and upset, first at Citta's commitment to the Buddhist life, and secondly, at his own misjudgement of Citta. Hence, his outburst against Citta [§9]. It is clear from this that Nāta,putta is not an accomplished meditator and has no experience of dhyana at all. At least, this is the Buddhist view of Nāta,putta.

The Acela Kassapa Sutta 2 (S 41.9) records how Citta's old friend, Acela Kassapa has been a naked wanderer for 30 years, but failed to gain any spiritual attainment. In reply to Kassapa's question about his

¹ See **Gilāna Dassana S** (S 41.10/4:303 f), SD 16.16 (1). For his biography, see Nyanaponika & Hecker, *Great Disciples of the Buddha*, 1997:365-372.

² S 41.10/4:303 f = SD 16.16.

³ This is a case where bad karma is still created when a person *unmindfully* makes a false statement. The intention here is rooted in delusion, and perhaps in greed and/or hate, too. See (**Kamma,vāda**) **Bhūmija S** (S 12.25/2:37-41), SD 31.2.

own attainments, Citta replies that, he has spent 30 years in the spiritual life (as a Buddhist). On his part, he has not only been able to master the four dhyanas, but has also attained non-return.⁴

All these points clearly suggest to us an important point not so well known to many of us, especially those who are not well familiar with the suttas—that Citta the householder is perhaps the greatest of laymen meditators, more specifically, dhyana-attainers.

2 Nirgrantha Nāta,putta in the early Buddhist texts

2.1 JAINISM AND BUDDHISM. Of all the non-Buddhist religions mentioned in the early Buddhist texts, early Jainism appears to be closest to early Buddhism.⁵ Both share many common terms (such as *sutta*, *sīla*, *samādhi*, *āsava*, *arahata*, *nibbāna*) and practices (the five precepts, the uposatha). One important difference is that while the Jains used what are loosely called “Jain Prakrits” (the chief of which was Ardha,māgadhī), the Buddha and the early Buddhists probably used a wide range of Prakrits, especially the local dialects.⁶

The key religious difference between the two systems is that early Buddhism unequivocally rejects any notion of an abiding soul (*attā*; Skt *ātman*), while Jainism holds the view of some kind of abiding entity (*jīva*). The early Buddhists are also less ritualistic, rejecting self-mortifying practices, while traditional Jains are strictly vegetarians and pro-life (such as wearing mouth-masks to avoid breathing in tiny living beings), but the stricter practitioners advocate ritual suicide (*sallekhana*).⁷

In the early Buddhist suttas, Nāta,putta is often presented as a tragic religious figure⁸ who, amongst other things, loses three of his chief disciples—Upāli the householder of Nālandā, Vappa the Sakya of Kapila, vatthu, and general Sīha of Vesālī—to the Buddhists.⁹ Ironically, it is almost the Buddhists who seem to have led to Nāta,putta’s tragic death, or to have indirectly cause it. After his chief disciple, general Upāli, converts to Buddhism, it is said that Nāta,putta, fell sick, coughed up blood and died as a result.¹⁰

2.2 NĀTA,PUTTA’S ENCOUNTER WITH CITTA

2.2.1 Nāta,putta’s fatal question. The Nigaṇṭha Nāta,putta Sutta is a very brief text recounting Citta the householder’s meeting with the Jain leader, Nirgrantha Nāta,putta. Here, in the Nigaṇṭha Nāta,putta Sutta, he is presented as an undiscerning teacher who at once takes Citta at his word, without further questions. After the preliminaries niceties, Nāta,putta asks Citta if he (Citta) has faith in the Buddha that thought-free meditation is possible. This is actually two questions: (1) do you have faith in the Buddha? (2) Do you really think thought-free meditation is possible?

Citta gives a careful but seemingly disarming answer to Nāta,putta’s delight:

“Here, bhante, I do not go by faith in the Blessed One, (when he says) thus, ‘*There is a samādhi without initial application and sustained application, there is a cessation of initial application and sustained application.*’”
[§§6.1-2]

2.2.2 Citta’s two verbal traps. In such a situation, the Buddha or a wise disciple would have further asked: “What do you mean by this?” The undiscerning Nāta,putta, however, jumps to the hasty conclusion that the courteous Buddhist before him is a convert, even a turncoat. So he falls into a verbal trap; actually *two* traps, in which he is irretrievably caught.

⁴ S 41.9/4:300-302 = SD 45.3. Cf **Acela Kassapa S 1** (S 12.17/2:18-22), SD 18.5.

⁵ On **Jainism & Nāta,putta**, see **Upāli S** (M 56) @ SD 27.1 (2.1).

⁶ See esp **Araṇa Vibhaṅga S** (M 139.12/3:234 f), SD 7.8. Pali, however, is a literary language, used in the compilation of the only complete surviving collection of early Buddhist teachings. Both Ardha,magadhi and Pali are Prakrits (vernaculars) used as literary languages for their respective religious texts: see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jain_Prakrit.

⁷ See **Upāli S** (M 56) @ SD 27.1 (2.1.2.1).

⁸ Comy refers to him as “a naked, crooked and luckless nirgrantha” (*nagga,bhoggam nissirikam nigaṇṭham*, SA 3:100).

⁹ See **Upāli S** (M 56) @ SD 27.1 (2.3).

¹⁰ **Upāli S** (M 56.31/1:387), SD 27.1.

This first statement by Citta is actually first of his verbal traps for the unwary Nāta,putta [§§6.1-2]. While to Nāta,putta (mainly on account of wishful thinking), Citta seems to denounce the Buddha, what Citta is really saying is that his dhyanic experiences are attained through knowledge, not mere *faith* in the Buddha. On account of his personal experience, he has no need of relying on faith in the Buddha—he has direct knowledge (*ñāṇa*), based on personal experience.¹¹

The second verbal trap that Citta lays for Nāta,putta, is when questions Nāta,putta, “What do you think, bhante, **which is more sublime [more exquisite] (*pañña, tara*): knowledge (*ñāṇa*) or faith (*saddhā*)?” [§7.1]. Nāta,putta, of course, replies that it is *knowledge* [§7.2]. The “three jewels” of the Jains, after all, are right view (*samyak darśana*, sometimes translated as “right faith”), right knowledge (*samyak jñāna*) and right conduct (*samyak cāritra*) (in an ascending order of priority). All this exchange occurs before the Jain congregation.**

2.2.3 Nāta,putta as dhyana-attainer. Citta then declares his deep familiarity (“to whatever extent I wish,” *yāvad eva ākaṅkhāmi*) with the four dhyanas [§8], ending with this important explanation:

It is indeed not so, bhante!¹² Knowing thus, seeing thus (*evam jānanto evam passanto*), bhante, in what other recluse or brahmin *need I go by faith* that there is a samadhi without initial application and sustained application, a cessation of initial application and sustained application?”

[§8.5]

Citta is saying that, having experienced dhyana all for himself, he has not need of faith in another, even in the Buddha himself.¹³

Nāta,putta is deeply dismayed and at once accuses Citta of dishonesty, trickery and falsehood [§9.3]. Citta responds by simply stating the obvious—that Nāta,putta himself has presumed and misconstrued Citta’s words and praising him, but now, knowing the truth, he is slighting him! These are contradicting acts, rooted in contradicting mental states. Obviously, one of these reactions must be false! Indeed, this is sufficient to discredit a person in a public debate, and more significantly, as a spiritual teacher. It is now obvious that Nāta,putta is not an accomplished meditator, not even a mindful or perceptive teacher.

2.2.4 The ten reasonable questions. The Nirgrantha Nāta,putta Sutta closes with Citta inviting Nāta,putta to a “Dharma-duel,” which clearly refers to the “ten reasonable questions” (*saha, dhammika pañha*)¹⁴ [§10.3], beginning with “what is ‘one’?,” “what is ‘two’?” and so on. These questions seem to be a sort of a standard list for personal exchanges between two teachers or proponents of differing teachings, to present the essence of their wisdom (or lack thereof), so that the audience could see for themselves whose teachings are really true, good, useful and related to the spiritual goal.

These ten questions are phrased distributively in the plural, and comprise three parts, that is, the question (*pañha*) itself; the synopsis (*uddesa*) or brief statement; and the answer proper (*vyākaraṇa*), that is, the detailed explanation. Here is the case for the first question:

- (1) the question: “What is one?”
- (2) the synopsis: “All beings are sustained by food”
- (3) the answer: “There are these four kinds of food (*āhāra*), namely: material food, contact, volition and consciousness” (followed by detailed explanations).¹⁵

The way Citta has formulated the ten questions means, at least for the challenge he has thrown to the nirgranthas, can confound us at first: the questions are “numbered” in a *cardinally distributive manner* (that is, in terms of quantity), thus:

¹¹ Sāriputta uses the same pun, but in a clearer context (addressing the Buddha), in reference to his own attainment, in **Pubba,koṭṭhaka S** (S 48.44/5:220-222), SD 10.7.

¹² Meaning that Nāta,putta has misunderstood and misconstrued Citta’s usage of the word “faith.”

¹³ Two important points should be noted here: (1) Citta clearly has faith in the Buddha, but this is *after* the fact: this is “wise faith” (*avecca-p, pāsāda*): see **Pañca Vera Bhaya S** (S 12.41.11/2:69), SD 3.3(4.2); (2) Even the Buddha himself places the Dharma above himself: this is *rightly putting the teaching before the teacher*: see **Gārava S** (S 6.2/1:138-140), SD 12.3; see also **The teacher or the teaching?** SD 3.14.

¹⁴ On the meaning of *saha, dhammika*, see §10.3 n.

¹⁵ See eg (**Nīvaraṇa Bojjhaṅga**) **Āhāra S** (S 46.51/5:102-107), SD 7.15.

<i>eko pañho</i>	<i>eko uddeso</i>	<i>ekam veyyākaraṇam,</i>	
<i>dve pañhā</i>	<i>dve uddesā</i>	<i>dve veyyākaraṇāni,</i>	
<i>tayo pañhā</i>	<i>tayo uddesā</i>	<i>tīṇi veyyākaraṇāni,</i>	
<i>cattāro pañhā</i>	<i>cattāro uddesā</i>	<i>cattārī veyyākaraṇāni,</i>	
<i>pañca pañhā</i>	<i>pañca uddesā</i>	<i>pañca veyyākaraṇāni,</i>	
<i>cha pañhā</i>	<i>cha uddesā</i>	<i>cha veyyākaraṇāni,</i>	
<i>satta pañhā</i>	<i>satta uddesā</i>	<i>satta veyyākaraṇāni,</i>	
<i>aṭṭha pañhā</i>	<i>aṭṭha uddesā</i>	<i>aṭṭha veyyākaraṇāni,</i>	
<i>nava pañhā</i>	<i>nava uddesā</i>	<i>nava veyyākaraṇāni,</i>	
<i>dasa pañhā</i>	<i>dasa uddesā</i>	<i>dasa veyyākaraṇāni.</i>	[§10.3]

It would have been easier for us if Citta had used the more conventional *ordinal* listing of the questions as *paṭhamo pañho* (“the first question”), *dutiyo pañho* (“the second question”), *tatiyo pañho* (“the third question”), and so on. This is, in fact, the usual way these questions are listed. But Citta is no ordinary layman: he is the wisest of them, and one with (one might say) a transcendental sense of humour!¹⁶

We could read what Citta is trying to impress on the nirgranthas thus: “First, there is the question on ‘one.’ Then, when that is completed, we have the second question, which makes it two question...and finally, we have ten questions.” In the minds of the ignorant, the half-informed or half-baked, even *one* such question can be daunting. What more *ten*! And from such a “devious” Buddhist such as Citta!

Traditionally, here Citta has invited Nāta,putta and the nirgranthas to give a “reasonable” response to these questions. Nirgrantha Nāta,putta is, however, either unwilling or unable to do so; hence, Citta, having no further reason to stay on, leaves [§10.4].¹⁷

2.2.4 The boy’s questions. The ten questions are preserved as “the boy’s questions” (*kumāra,pañha*) in **the Khuddaka,pāṭha** (Khp 4)¹⁸ and known as “the great questions” (*mahā pañha*) in **the Mahā Pañha Sutta 1** (A 10.27), where they are explained in some detail.¹⁹ Within each set, the question arises for each number, the synopsis given, and the practitioner is to reflect on its details by way of spiritual training.

Why are these ten questions called “the boy’s questions”? The explanation is given in **the Param’attha,jotikā** (the Khuddaka Pāṭha Commentary), where it is said that it has to do with the ordination (*upa-sampadā*) of the 7-year-old arhat, Sopaka. On his attaining of direct knowledge (*aññā*), the Buddha decides, on account of his attainment, he should be able to answer these questions, which would also be his mode of ordination (KhpA 75 f).

Interestingly, the word “boy” (*kumāra*) here reminds us of “brahmin youth” (*māṇava*), a term for a young brahmin student who is accomplished in the three Vedas. A young householder, one who is heir to his father’s estate is called “young householder” (*gaha.pati,putta*).²⁰ These two terms, however, are never used for Buddhist renunciants. However, erstwhile members of the kshatriya (noble) class who have renounced are often referred to as “sons of family” (*kula,putta*).²¹ However, the term *kumāra* seems to be applied only to the ten questions.

— — —

¹⁶ On humour in Buddhism, see **The Buddha’s humour** = SD 50.1.

¹⁷ On the possible consequence that the questioner might face (head-splitting) for not answering such a question, see **Ambaṭṭha S** (D 3.1.21.1/1:95) + SD 21.3 (4).

¹⁸ Khp 4/2, explained in KhpA 75-88.

¹⁹ A 10.27/5:50-54 = SD 85.15.

²⁰ On *gaha.pati,putta*, see **Sigāl’ovāda S** (D 31.1.2/3:180) n = SD 4.1.

²¹ V 1:15,1 (Yasa), 350,34 (3 of them); D 1:93,20 (Ambaṭṭha *māṇava* is said to be *kula,putta*, too); M 1:192,5; A 2:249,11. In **Vakkali S** (S 22.87.39/3:124), SD 8.8, the Buddha refers to Vakkali posthumously as *kula,putta* instead of *bhikkhu*. Vakkali was prob in his early 20s. The aged Pukkusāti is similarly referred to as *kula,putta* in **Dhātu Vibhaṅga S** (M 140), SD 4.17.3n. See also **Mahā,parinibbāna S** (D 16.5.8ab), SD 9(7g).

The Discourse on Nigaṇṭha Nāta,putta

S 41.8/4:298-300

Citta meets Nāta,putta

2 Now at that time, Nirgrantha Nāta,putta²² [298] had arrived in Macchikā,saṇḍa²³ with a great company of nirgranthas [Jain monks].

3 Citta the houselord²⁴ heard that Nirgrantha Nāta,putta had arrived in Macchikā,saṇḍa with a great company of nirgranthas.

4 Then Citta the houselord, along with some laymen followers, approached Nirgrantha Nāta,putta, exchanged courteous and friendly greetings, and then sat down at one side.

5.1 Nirgrantha Nāta,putta said this to Citta the houselord, sitting thus at one side:

“Do you, houselord, have faith in the recluse Gotama when he says,

5.2 ‘There is a samadhi without initial application and sustained application [thinking and pondering]; there is a cessation of initial application and sustained application’?”²⁵

Citta tricks Nāta,putta

6.1 “Here, bhante, **I do not go by faith in the Blessed One,**²⁶ (when I say) thus,

6.2 ‘There is a samadhi without initial application and sustained application, there is a cessation of initial application and sustained application.’”

6.3 When this was said, Nigaṇṭha Nāta,putta looked around²⁷ at his own retinue, and said,

6.4 “See this, sirs! How straight is this Citta the houselord! How honest [not dishonest] is this Citta the houselord! How untricky [not a trickster] is this Citta the houselord!

6.5 One who thinks that initial application [thinking] can be stopped would imagine that he could catch the wind in a net,

6.6 one who thinks that sustained application [pondering] can be stopped would imagine that he could stop the flow of the river Ganges with his own fist.”

7.1 “What do you think, bhante, **which is more sublime [more exquisite]: knowledge or faith?**”

7.2 “Surely, houselord, knowledge is more sublime than faith.”²⁸

Citta’s lion-roar

8.1²⁹ Now I, bhante, to whatever extent I wish,

²² He was **Mahāvīra** (b 549-477 BCE),²² the historical founder of Jainism: see **Upāli S** (M 56) @ SD 27.1 (2.1).

²³ Macchika,saṇḍa, lit “fishers’ clump,” a grove belonging to Citta, and a town in Kāsī, 30 yojanas from Sāvathī (DhA 2:79), the home of Citta the houselord. Located there is **Ambāṭaka,vana** (wild mango park) presented by Citta as a monastery to the monks headed by Mahānāma. From this Sutta, it is possible that Macchika,saṇḍa was one of the centres of the nirgranthas.

²⁴ Citta is declared by the Buddha to be the foremost of Dharma-speakers amongst the laymen disciples (A 1:26): see **Gilāna Dassana S** (S 41.10/4:303 f), SD 16.16 (1).

²⁵ As will be apparent soon, this clearly refers to the 2nd dhyana.

²⁶ *Na khv-āhaṃ ettha bhante bhagavato saddhāya gacchāmi.*

²⁷ “Looked around,” Be Ee SA:Be *ullokētvā*, “having looked up at”; Ke Se SA:Ce SA:Se *olokētvā*, “having looked down at (with regard)”; Se *apalokētvā*, “having looked towards” (Cf **Mahā,parinibbāna S** (D 16.4.1/2:122 n), SD 9). Comy: “*Ullokētvā*: Puffing up his body, drawing in his belly, craning forth his neck, looking all around, he then looked up” (*ullokētvāti kāyaṃ unnāmetvā kucchiṃ nīharitvā gīvaṃ paggayha sabbam disaṃ pekkhamāno ullokētvā*, SA 1:300). The context suggests a sense of overconfidence and pride on Nāta,putta’s part; hence. He “looks around” at his congregation for acquiescence. Cf §9.2.

²⁸ *Saddhāya kho gaha,pati nāṇaṃ y’eva paṇīta,taraṃ.* See Intro (1.2).

²⁹ *Ahaṃ kho bhante yāvad eva ākaṅkhāmi vivicc’eva kāmehi vivicca akusalehi dhammehi sa,vitakkaṃ sa,vicāraṃ viveka,jam pīti,sukhaṃ paṭhamam jhānaṃ upasampajja viharāmi.* On the 1st dhyana, see **Dhyana** @ SD 8.4 (5.1) or SID: jhāna 4.

having entered, dwell in **the first dhyana, that is quite detached from sensual pleasures**, detached from unwholesome mental states, accompanied by initial application and sustained application, accompanied by zest and joy, born of seclusion; [299]

8.2 ³⁰And I, too, bhante, to whatever extent I wish,

with the stilling of initial application and sustained application, by gaining inner tranquillity and oneness of mind, having entered, dwell in **the second dhyana**, free from initial application and sustained application, accompanied by zest and joy born of concentration.

8.3 ³¹And I, too, bhante, to whatever extent I wish,

with the fading away of zest, I, having entered, dwell equanimous, mindful and fully aware, and experiences joy with the body. Having entered, I dwell in **the third dhyana**, of which the noble ones declare, ‘Happily he dwells in equanimity and mindfulness.’

8.4 ³²And I, too, bhante, to whatever extent I wish,

with the abandoning of joy and abandoning of pain—and with the earlier disappearance of pleasure and displeasure—having entered, dwell in **the fourth dhyana** that is neither painful nor pleasant, and with mindfulness fully purified by equanimity.³³

8.5 It is indeed not so, bhante! Knowing thus, seeing thus, bhante, in what other recluse or brahmin *need I go by faith* that there is a samadhi without initial application and sustained application, a cessation of initial application and sustained application?³⁴

Nāta,putta is outwitted

9.2 When this was said, Nirgrantha Nāta,putta turned around³⁵ and said this to his own congregation:

9.3 “See this, sirs! How crooked is this Citta the house-lord! How dishonest is this Citta the house-lord! How tricky is this Citta the house-lord!”

9.4 “But, bhante, only just now we understand you as saying:

‘See this, sirs! How straight is this Citta the house-lord! How honest [not dishonest] is this Citta the house-lord! How untricky [not tricky] is this Citta the house-lord!’

9.5 But now we understand you as saying:

‘See this, sirs! How crooked is this Citta the house-lord! How dishonest is this Citta the house-lord! How tricky is this Citta the house-lord!’

10.1 If, bhante, your former statement is true, your later statement must be false! If, bhante, your later statement is true, your former statement must be false!

³⁰ *Ahaṃ kho bhante yāvad eva ākaṅkhāmi vitakka,vicārānaṃ vūpasamā ajjhataṃ sampasādanaṃ cetaso ekodi,-bhāvaṃ avitakkaṃ avicāraṃ samādhi,jaṃ pīti,sukhaṃ dutiyaṃ jhānaṃ upasampajja viharāmi.* On the 2nd dhyana, see **Dhyana** @ SD 8.4 (5.2) or SID: jhāna 4.

³¹ *Ahaṃ kho bhante yāvad eva ākaṅkhāmi pītiyā ca virāgā ca upekkhako ca viharati sato ca sampajāno, sukhañ ca kāyena paṭisaṃvedeti. Yaṃ taṃ ariyā ācikkhanti: upekkhako satimā sukha,viharīti, tatiyaṃ jhānaṃ upasampajja viharāmi.* On the 3rd dhyana, see **Dhyana** @ SD 8.4 (5.3) or SID: jhāna 4.

³² *Ahaṃ kho bhante yāvad eva ākaṅkhāmi sukhasa ca pahāṇā dukkhasa ca pahāṇā pubb’eva somanassa,domanassānaṃ atthaṃ,gamā adukkhaṃ asukhaṃ upekkhā,sati,parisuddhiṃ catutthaṃ jhānaṃ upasampajja viharāmi.* On the 4th dhyana, see **Dhyana** @ SD 8.4 (5.4) or SID: jhāna 4.

³³ Similarly, to his old friend, Acela Kassapa, a naked wanderer for 30 fruitless years, he speaks of the 4 dhyanas: **Acela Kassapa S 2** (S 41.9/4:300-302), SD 45.3. Cf **Acela Kassapa S 1** (S 12.17/2:18-22), SD 18.5.

³⁴ *Na so khvāhaṃ bhante evaṃ jānanto evaṃ passanto kassa aññassa samaṇassa vā brāhmaṇassa vā saddhāya gamissāmi* “atthi avitakko avicāro samādhi atthi vitakka,vicārānaṃ nirodhōti. Here, Nāta,putta has fallen into both of Citta’s verbal traps [2.2]. On account of Citta’s personal experience, he has no need of relying on faith in the Buddha. Sāriputta uses the same pun, in reference to his own attainment, in **Pubba,koṭṭhaka S** (S 48.44/5:220-222), SD 10.7.

³⁵ “Looked around,” Be Ee Ke Se *apaloketvā*; Ce *ulloketvā*. Here *apaloketvā* (the most common reading), with a sense of “looking for approval” (CPD), ie, looking embarrassed or angry at being betrayed or exposed, fits the context best. Understandably, he loudly complains to his congregation, again seeking their support. Cf §6.3.

Citta challenges Nāta,putta

10.2 Now, bhante, we come to these ten reasonable questions.³⁶

10.3 As you understand their meaning, let you and the company of nirgranthas so respond to me.³⁷

one question,	one synopsis,	one answer; ³⁸
two questions,	two synopses,	two answers; ³⁹
three questions,	three synopses,	three answers;
four questions,	four synopses,	four answers;
five questions,	five synopses,	five answers;
six questions,	six synopses,	six answers;
seven questions,	seven synopses,	seven answers;
eight questions, [300]	eight synopses,	eight answers;
nine questions,	nine synopses,	nine answers;
ten questions,	ten synopses,	ten answers.”

10.4 Then, Citta the houselord, not getting any answer from Nirgrantha Nāya,putta,⁴⁰ rose from his seat and left.

— evaṃ —

071128; 121002; 121004; 130302

³⁶ *Ime kho pana bhante dasa saha, dhammikā pañhā āgacchanti.* Comy glosses *saha, dhammika* as “reasonable” (*sa, kāraṇā*, SA 3:100): cf **Ambaṭṭha S** (D 3.1.20/1:94 = SD 21.3), where Comy explains that “even if one oneself does not desire to answer, it must necessarily be clarified” (DA 1:263).

³⁷ *Yadā tesam attham ājāneyyāsi atha maṃ paṭihareyyāsi saddhim nigaṇṭha parisāya.* Comy gives a fanciful explanation (see S:B 1446 n323) which need not detain us. In **Deva, dāha S** (M 101), we find two occurrences of the helpful phrase, *saha, dhammikaṃ vāda, paṭihāraṃ*, “a reasonable defence of one’s doctrine” (M 2:218, 22, 220, 8), which Comy glosses as follows: “*saha, dhammika* means with cause, with reason; *vāda, paṭihāra* means ‘return speech’” (*saha, dhammikaṃ sa, hetukaṃ sa, kāraṇam; vāda, paṭihāraṃ ti paccāgamanaka, vādam*, MA 4:4). We can easily surmise here (what Citta is saying) is that Nāta,putta and the nirgranthas are invited to give a “reasonable” response to these questions (if they could). Nirgrantha Nāta,putta is either unwilling or unable to do so; hence, Citta, having no further reason to stay on, leaves [§10.4]. See Intro (2.2.4).

³⁸ *Eko pañho eko uddeso ekaṃ veyyākaraṇam.* Comy says that these are “the boy’s questions” (*kumāra, pañha*): see Khp 4/2 = D 3:211; KhpA 75-78; PmA 1:65, 67. The 10 questions here are actually found in **Mahā Pañha S 1** (A 10.27) where they are fully listed and explained (A 10.27/5:50-54), SD 85.15.

³⁹ *Dve pañhā dve uddesā dve veyyākaraṇāni.* Although the questions here are phrased distributively in the plural, from **Mahā Pañha S 1** (A 10.27, see prec n), it is clear that they refer to the respective “sets” as in the *Kumāra, pañha*. Within each set, the question arises for each of the items, on which the practitioner is to reflect by way of spiritual training: see **A 10.27/5:50-54 = SD 85.15**. See Intro (2.2.4).

⁴⁰ *Na khv-āham ettha bhante bhagavato saddhāya gacchāmi.*